

Serial No. 09/833,947

Applicant: STALEY

Amendment in Response to Office Action of 12/29/2003

Page 9

---

Remarks

The Examiner's Office Action has been carefully reviewed.

Submitted herewith for the Examiner's approval are new formal drawings with the correction made to two reference numerals 16's in Figure 2. Further, circuitry 74 in Figure 3 has been corrected to make it look more like a circuit component rather than a black box. Further changes are not deemed necessary since in Figure 1, elements 62, 64 relate to clear plastic covers while 76 is an on/off button. Such items are not shown as black boxes. In Figure 2, element 38 is a face, 40 is a window, and 42 is a covering and need not have wordings associated therewith. Lastly, Figure 5, element 76 is an on/off switch and wording is not needed. It is deemed that these corrections overcome the Examiner's objections with respect to the Figures.

The Examiner's rejection of Claims 2 - 8 "under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pasawicz (US Patent No. 6,329,943) in view of Sottile (US Patent No. 5,203,622)" is noted. Such rejection is traversed. Although the Examiner suggests that certain features of the prior art may be combined, it is urged that there is no teaching within the prior art for the Examiner's proposed combination.

Serial No. 09/833,947

Applicant: STALEY

Amendment in Response to Office Action of 12/29/2003

Page 10

---

It is further considered that even if there were a suggestion for the Examiner's proposed combination, the resulting structure would still fail to meet the terms of applicant's claims. Note in particular the subject matter of Claim 2 wherein the two light sources, the LED and the light bulb, are fixedly positioned at opposite ends of the housing. Further, specifically claimed is the common power source for the two sources of illumination not found in the prior art.

It would appear that the Examiner has merely gleaned miscellaneous features in the prior art and has attempted to combine them without a teaching for their combination. The only teaching is in applicant's disclosure which, by definition, is not prior art. But even if there were a teaching for the combination, the resulting structure would still fail to anticipate applicant's invention for the reasons set forth herein above.

It is deemed that the amendments herein overcome all grounds of objection and rejection. Reconsideration and a Notice of Allowance are requested.